25

26

27

28

LELAND, PARACHINI, STEINBERG, MATZGER & MELNICK, LLP

MITCHELL CHYETTE (State Bar # 113087) LELAND, PARACHINI, STEINBERG, MATZGER & MELNICK, LLP 333 Market Street - 27<sup>th</sup> Floor San Francisco, California 94105-2171 Telephone: (415) 957-1800 Facsimile: (415) 974-1520

Attorneys for William F. Bottoms, Mary A. Bottoms, as individuals and as trustees for the Bottom Family 1989 Trust, and The Blue Oak Charitable Fund, a California non-profit public benefit corporation

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

## NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

## SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

MARY A BOTTOMS, as individuals and as trustees for the Bottoms Family 1989 Trust; THE BLUE OAK CHARITABLE FUND, a California non-profit public benefit corporation,

Plaintiff,

VS.

ATKN COMPANY OF CALIFORNIA, f/k/a Guy F. Atkinson Company of California; ATKN COMPANY, a Nevada corporation, f/k/a/ Guy F. Atkinson Company, and DOES 1-100

Defendants.

CASE NO. C 05 03045 EMC

STIPULATION AND ORDER EXTENDING TIME TO ANSWER, AND EXTENDING THE CASE SCHEDULE AND INITIAL CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE [CIV. LOC. R. 6-2]

This action was filed on July 27, 2005. Counsel for the defendants executed a Notice of Waiver of Service on September 2, 2005. An answer to the Complaint would be due on October 24, 2005.

The defendants are in bankruptcy (U.S.Bankr. Ct. No. 97-33694-TC (N.D. Cal.).)

Modified relief from the automatic stay was obtained by the plaintiff for the purpose of pursuing this claim to the extent of the defendants' insurance.

{S:\bottwi\0001\pld\427153.DOC}

STIPULATION AND ORDER EXTENDING TIME TO ANSWER, AND EXTENDING THE CASE SCHEDULE AND INITIAL CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE

The action involves a claim of environmental damage that extends for many years into the past. The plaintiffs submit that the identification of the insurers has been somewhat hampered by the lack of complete records on insurance going back far enough.

The defendants have tendered the defense of this claim to those insurers that we have been able to identify. Some of these insurers have inquired about the defendants' deadline to answer the complaint and wish to avoid any prejudice while they determine whether they actually insured the defendants and, if so, what their duties under their policies are.

Counsel for the defendants forwarded this request to counsel for the plaintiffs, who hereby stipulates to an extension of the time to answer.

No request for additional time has heretofore been made by any of the parties.

This extension of time has implications for the case management schedule. Accordingly, the parties stipulate that the case management schedule should be adjusted accordingly. By adding 120 days to the dates on the existing case management schedule, the parties respectfully submit that the schedule should be amended as follows:

l		Original due	New due	2
l		<u>date</u>	<u>date</u>	
l	Answer	10/24/05	2/21/06	
	Last day to meet and confer re initial disclosures, early settlement, ADR process selection, and discovery plan	11/16/05	3/16/06	
	Last day to file Joint ADR Certification With Stipulation to ADR Process of Notice of Need for ADR Phone Conference	11/16/05	3/16/06	
	Last day to complete initial disclosures or state objection in Rule 26(f) Report, file/serve Case Management Statement, and file/serve Rule 26(f) Report	11/30/05	3/30/06	
	Case Management Conference in Courtroom C, 15th Floor at 1:30 PM	12/7/05	<del>-4/6/06</del>	4/5/06
1	SO STIPLII ATED:			

SO STIPULATED:

(S:\bottwi\0001\pld\427153.DOC)

STIPULATION AND ORDER EXTENDING TIME TO ANSWER, AND EXTENDING THE CASE SCHEDULE AND INITIAL CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE